

E7 279. (Amended) A system according to claim [54] 81, wherein the display device is arranged and configured to receive an analog signal.

E7 280. (Amended) A system according to claim [54] 81, wherein the display device is arranged and configured to receive a digital signal.

Please add claim 81 as follows:

E8 281. (New) A system according to claim 54, wherein the output connector is connected to a display device.

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 1, 1999. A Petition to extend the time for responding from September 1, 1999, to December 1, 1999, together with a check in the amount of \$435, is submitted herewith.

The Examiner rejected claims 54-80 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Examiner rejected claims 54-80 under § 103 as obvious over *Shibata et al.* Applicants have amended claims 54, 56, 59, 61, 71, 74, 75, 79, and 80 to more clearly define the invention. In addition, Applicants have added new claim 81. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

A. Rejections Under Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-type Double Patenting.

Claims 54-80 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over selected claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,281. A Terminal Disclaimer will be submitted upon notification of allowable claims.

B. Rejections Under § 103

Claims 54–80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Shibata et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,477,546.

Shibata et al. fails to disclose or suggest several of the limitations recited in Applicants' claims and does not render the presently claimed subject matter obvious in view of the level of knowledge possessed by one having ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 54, as amended, includes the limitation that the communication system is capable of selectively transmitting and receiving audio and video signals over either one of an analog or a digital communication channel. *Shibata et al.* teaches a system that is specifically limited to transmitting and receiving communication frames through a digital communication channel only (see, e.g., *Shibata et al.*, column 2, lines 29–35; column 5, lines 24–26; column 14, lines 30–32 & 56–57, column 15, lines 8–21; and elsewhere).

Shibata et al. provides no teaching or suggestion that would motivate the skilled artisan to modify the *Shibata et al.* system so as to be capable of communicating over an analog communication channel. Even if *Shibata et al.* provides such a suggestion, Applicants submit that such a modification, without the benefit of Applicants' disclosure, would require undo experimentation.

Amended claim 54 further requires an output interface that communicates the remote video signal between the local receive unit and the output connector of the output interface. A control unit controls the presentation of the remote video signal through the output connector. The Examiner states that *Shibata et al.* discloses an RS-232 connector (105 Fig. 1) for connecting to an external computer and a control unit that controls the presentation of the remote video signal on a display device.

A careful reading of *Shibata et al.* makes clear that the RS-232 connector does not communicate a remote video signal as suggested by the Examiner. *Shibata et al.*, in Fig. 1 and at column 5, line 67 through column 6, line 12, discloses an RS-232C connector 105 connected to a data multiplexer/demultiplexer 20 which delivers multiplexed or demultiplexed data to the RS-232C connector 105. Further reference is made to column 7, lines 13-22; column 12, line 60 through column 13, line 17; and column 15, lines 22-67. Moreover, Fig. 18 shows RS-232C connector 2821 connected to a data interface 2815.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that *Shibata et al.* discloses a source receive unit (multimedia multiplexing and demultiplexing and interterminal signal unit, 8 Fig. 1, Col. 5, line 31-38) for receiving a source audio signal and a source video signal. *Shibata et al.*, at column 5, lines 31-38, describes the multiplexing/demultiplexing and interterminal signal unit 8 as a device that performs various controls between teleconference systems that communicate through a communication circuit. The control unit 8 disclosed in *Shibata et al.* does not receive a source audio signal and a source video signal as required in Applicants' amended claim 54.

The Examiner further states on page 10 of the Office Action that *Shibata et al.* discloses a local transmission unit (network interface and communication network control unit, 9 Fig 1, Col. 5, lines 24-26) for transmitting the source audio and video signals over the communication channel and a local receive unit for receiving remote audio and video signals from the communication channel (network interface and communication network control unit, 9 Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 24-26). *Shibata et al.* teaches that the network interfacing communications network control unit 9 is connected to a digital communications network through the D/R 10 (column 5, lines 24-26). *Shibata et al.* does not disclose or suggest a local transmission unit or a local receive unit that respectively transmits and receives audio and video signal information over either one of an analog or a digital communication channel as is required in Applicants' amended

claim 54. Moreover, Applicants submit that any such modification of the *Shibata et al.* system that would permit it to communicate over an analog communication channel would require undo experimentation.

For at least the reasons set forth above and in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 54 is not rendered obvious under *Shibata et al* and is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that claims 55–81 are patentable over *Shibata et al.* for at least the reason that these claims depend from patentable independent claim 54.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration, reexamination, and a Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
3100 Norwest Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-5300

Date: 11/23/99



Erik G. Swenson
Reg. No. 45,147
EGS/mm